



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BISHOP McQUAID OF ROCHESTER

HIS EPISCOPAL CAREER (1868-1902)

The beginnings of Bishop McQuaid's episcopate were not more promising of success than the early years of his life. Small as his diocese was with its thirty-nine priests, it was not too small for the brewing of more than ordinary trouble the very first year of its existence. The only other city in the diocese besides Rochester was the storm center. After a preliminary settlement of the O'Flaherty case in Auburn,⁴¹ the storm broke out with renewed fury under the opposition of a small party of Malcontents that rallied about the removed and suspended pastor of the Church of the Holy Family. The church had to be closed until a great majority of the congregation organized to give the guarantee demanded by Bishop McQuaid for the maintenance of Catholic order and discipline. He was pleased finally to be able to communicate, April 8, 1869, his approval of a set of resolutions sent to him by these faithful Catholics.

The resolutions at Markham Hall, in Auburn, on the first of April, signed then and afterwards by five hundred men (members of the parish of the Holy Family) are now before me.

The language of the resolutions is the language of Catholics who know, acknowledge, and hold to the Faith and Discipline of the Catholic Church.

That the Rev. Martin Kavanagh is not now living in that parish and attending to its spiritual wants is no fault of his, nor is it mine. He has been pastor of the church since the 15th day of February, but unable to enter on the discharge of his duties through the opposition, even to violence, of the Rev. Thomas O'Flaherty and his organized party of Malcontents.

With great persistence they have maintained that this opposition was unanimous on the part of the congregation of the Holy Family. Telegraphic dispatches and newspaper reports have circulated this charge all over the country. Whence originated the dispatches and reports no one in Auburn needs to be told. It was the duty of the congregation thus calumniated to repel the calumny and justify their claim to the name of Catholic Congregation.

Now that you have spoken and acted, and can no longer be misrepresented, I will request the Rev. Martin Kavanagh to return to Auburn, and I shall expect you to put him in possession of the Church and church-property, and to protect and maintain him in the peaceable exercise of his functions as Pastor of the Church of the Holy Family.

If the misguided men who have made themselves conspicuous in the past weeks by their contempt for church discipline, disregard for the law, and loud and foul abuse of their Bishop should threaten to continue their trampling upon your rights as a congregation, then call to your assistance the proper civil authorities and with their help assert and maintain your rights.

As matters now stand, no Catholic can be deceived as to the line of conduct it is his duty to follow; no member of your parish can stand on neutral

⁴¹ Bishop McQuaid's Sermon in St. Mary's Church, February 28, 1839, *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, March 2, 1869.

ground; he is for the Bishop and established discipline, or against the Bishop and for the law which the Rev. Thomas O'Flaherty has sought to establish. The stale story of O'Flaherty's permanent appointment by the Pope as Pastor and Dean may have deceived some for a time; no one is now deceived by it but those who are willing to be deceived. The story originated in the same prolific brain which gave birth to the other founding that the Rev. Mr. Kavanagh had been removed from Auburn on a previous occasion by command of Cardinal Barnabo.

After an appeal to the American Protestant public, to mob law, to the Supreme Court, it will be waste of time and money to carry an appeal to Rome. Nor is it at all likely that the "intelligent and influential" mob that hooted a Bishop through the streets, that with fury of madmen hindered the celebration of Mass on the following morning, will be able to demonstrate to Rome the many excellencies and Christian virtues, the sound Catholic teaching and the usefulness of the labors of their late Pastor.⁴²

Contrary to Bishop McQuaid's expectations, O'Flaherty carried his case to Rome, inasmuch as the Archbishop of New York failed to act on the strength of an appeal taken to the Metropolitan Court, March 25, 1869,⁴³ by the suspended priest, who persistently ignored the Diocesan Court established in the Diocesan Council. The Bishop's presence in Rome at the time, in attendance upon the Vatican Council, made it possible for him to take charge of the matter personally. "A few words of explanation at the Propaganda soon satisfied them with regard to O'Flaherty's character and acts. Still I hold it to be wrong for the Propaganda to entertain appeals when a priest refuses to have his case examined by the regularly appointed tribunal." Bishop McQuaid consoled himself with the thought that the Vatican Council would "in all probability regulate some of these matters. Instead of breaking down discipline, there is more likelihood of there being a straightening up in some points. Some who are clamorous for the rights of priests may find that there are rights also for bishops and people."⁴⁴

The Vatican Council never reached matters of this kind, as its energies in the short period of its activity were largely concerned with the great question of papal infallibility. The opportuneness of the definition of this dogma did not appeal to Bishop McQuaid, who consistently joined the opposition on every possible occasion. "I am afraid," he wrote Dr. Corrigan,

⁴² *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, April 13; from the *Auburn Morning News*, April 10, 1869.

⁴³ Metropolitan, New York. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

⁴⁴ Bishop McQuaid to Dr. Corrigan, Rome, February 6, 1870: Bishops to M. A. C., 1865-1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

then of Seton Hall, "that there is a determination to pass abstract questions as decrees that may be true enough in themselves, but which will be highly injurious to us in America from the handle they will give our enemies. If I had not confidence in God's protecting hand, I would run from the Council in despair, so strangely ignorant are many men of what is going on in the world. We need the earnest prayers of all earnest Catholics."⁴⁶ Not only the decrees themselves, but also the methods pursued in the Council were objectionable in some respects to Bishop McQuaid and others. As early as December 12, 1869, twenty prelates, amongst whom were two Americans, Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis and Bishop McQuaid of Rochester, presented a petition to the Holy Father, suggesting certain emendations in the published order of the Council to bring out more plainly the fullness of examination and the most perfect liberty of discussion within the Council.⁴⁶ These prelates also demanded, as modern times seemed to require, greater publicity despite the oath of secrecy exacted of the members of the Council. They received practically no satisfaction at the time,⁴⁷ but changes were later made in the published order of the Council,⁴⁸ and Cardinal Manning was released from the oath of secrecy that he might keep the British Cabinet informed through Odo Russell of the real state of affairs, so often misrepresented in the campaign of vilification then waged against the Council, while, also, a Bishop of the Italian, French, and German tongues was likewise freed from the oath of secrecy.⁴⁹

At the beginning of 1870, when the petition for the definition of papal infallibility was being circulated, Bishop McQuaid's name appeared amongst the one hundred and thirty-six prelates of the opposition, in the petition of the twenty-seven bishops from English-speaking countries, twenty of whom were Americans, who asked the Holy Father not to submit the question of papal infallibility to the Council for definition.⁵⁰ The great majority

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum. Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, col. 915 *sqq.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Col. 917.

⁴⁸ February 20, 1870. *Ibid.*, Col. 67-69.

⁴⁹ CARDINAL MANNING, *Reminiscences of the Vatican Council*, 1887, in PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. ii, p. 454; cf. note, September 18, 1887; *ibid.*, p. 455.

⁵⁰ *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum, Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, Col. 947.

of the prelates demanded the definition, and so the matter was submitted to the consideration of the Council, which finally, June 3, 1870, decided to close the general discussion "*De Romano Pontifice*."⁵¹ The very next day eighty-one prelates, amongst whom there were eight Americans and one of these, Bishop McQuaid, protested against this procedure,⁵² but the protest was not admitted,⁵³ as the discussion had been ample almost beyond endurance and there was still room for five individual discussions, namely, on the proemium and the four chapters following. In the course of the fifth discussion a division was taken by mutual consent on July 13, when 451 voted the definition of papal infallibility, 88 voted against it, and 62 gave a conditional vote.⁵⁴ Bishop McQuaid was amongst the 88 who voted against the definition.⁵⁵

A deputation of these prelates, who were not willing to define infallibility as proposed, waited upon the Holy Father in the evening of July 15 with a statement that they would vote in favor of infallibility, provided some changes were made in the Constitution on the Church of Christ.⁵⁶ Pius IX ordered Archbishop Darboy of Paris to reduce to writing what they desired. Chapter III, *On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff*, teaches and declares "that, by the appointment of our Lord, the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; etc., etc." The opposition requested the suppression of the phrase that makes the power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over all other churches "truly episcopal." The Canon concluding this chapter pronounces an anathema upon any "who assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power." The opposition also wished this phrase expunged. Finally Chapter IV, *Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff*, defines "that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*,

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, col. 748, Col. 984 *sqq.*

⁵² *Ibid.*, col. 986 *sqq.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, col. 988.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 760.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 1003.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 1702.

that is, when, in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding the faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, is, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; etc., etc.” Here the opposition wished an addition to be made so as to qualify the manner in which the Pope is to exercise his office as teacher of all Christians, namely, “resting on the testimonies of the Churches,” or “by the use of means that had always been employed in the Catholic Church,” or “Bishops not excluded.” The evident purpose of all this was not to sacrifice episcopal prerogative to papal prerogative. Archbishop Darboy declared that nearly all the Fathers who had voted against papal infallibility in the General Congregation would vote *placet* in the Public Session if the desired changes were made.⁵⁷ Pius IX had the undersecretary of the Council refuse any such concessions as were requested, committing all to a General Congregation, but with definitive judgment reserved to himself. These Fathers then held meetings, July 16 and 17, and decided by a vote of thirty-six against twenty-eight to absent themselves from the Public Session, which was fixed for July 18, when the papal prerogatives of a universal primacy and of infallibility were to be publicly attested by a vote of *placet* or *non placet*.⁵⁸ Bishop McQuaid was not present at this session,⁵⁹ although he did not leave Rome until the evening of that day.⁶⁰ He had obtained permission from the Council, July 16, to leave without the obligation to return, “on account of several needs of his diocese most recently erected.”⁶¹ Bishop McQuaid made his way home as quickly as possible, and on August 28, 1870, gave the people in his Cathedral a good account of the definition of papal infallibility at the Council of the Vatican.

The question is simple enough. The definition is clear enough. It answers objections as well as states the doctrine. . . . I have now no difficulty in accepting the dogma, although to the last I opposed it, because,

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, col. 992.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, col. 1702 sq.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 1003.

⁶⁰ Bishop Bayley to Dr. Corrigan, July 28, 1870; Bishops to M. A. C., 1865-1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

⁶¹ *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum, Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, col. 762b.

somehow or other, it was in my head that the bishops ought to be consulted, and I know, my friends, that all you want is the truth of God's Church, and when the question so long unsettled was settled, it was a relief and a pleasure to the minds of many.⁶²

Bishop McQuaid had advanced a real and not a fictitious excuse to be freed permanently of the obligation of further attendance at the Vatican Council. He was thoroughly conscious of "the needs of his diocese most recently erected," for he wrote late in life in a reminiscent mood: "When a Bishop's responsibility came to me, it did not take me long to see that my first duty was to take care of the children of the people, and as essential thereto the establishment of a teaching Sisterhood. . . . My second duty was to build up a seminary that was to give a priestly priesthood to the Church."⁶³ The O'Flaherty case and the Vatican Council had not permitted Bishop McQuaid to begin the realization of this ambitious program of work. Upon his return home he established all that he could at the time for ecclesiastical education, the Preparatory Seminary back of the Cathedral House. He also vigorously set to work upon building up a parochial school system of education that was to reach every Catholic child in districts of sufficient Catholic population to support a good parochial school. This meant the renewal of the school question, the agitation of which had ceased for quite a time, so that the resurrection of a seemingly dead issue was anything but welcome to certain circles even within the Catholic Church. "You may remember," he later wrote Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland, "how pacific and non-offensive ecclesiastics spoke of me when I raked the ashes off the smouldering school question and flamed the embers into a blaze. My own Archbishop was full of wise caution and Archbishop Bayley was afraid I was going too far. I send you by this mail a marked copy of one of our papers. The writer of the article, who is the editor himself, thinks that I was only a little in advance of my time."⁶⁴ A storm cleared the atmosphere for better action not only abroad but also at home. On December 19, 1870, Bishop McQuaid wrote Dr. Corrigan, who had come from Seton Hall College to assist at the solemn blessing

⁶² *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, August 29, 1870.

⁶³ Bishop McQuaid to Mother Xavier, February 20, 1907, St. Elizabeth College Letters.

⁶⁴ February 25, 1887 No. 4, No. A, Bishops from 1872-1888, Cleveland Diocesan Archives.

of the Cathedral by Archbishop McCloskey, and meanwhile returned home:

I have had a rather lively time here since your visit, with not a little to annoy me. I requested the removal of the Sisters of Charity from the Asylum and Parochial School. The Brothers undertook to resent the action of the Bishop, and broke up their school, saying to the children that they would not wait to be kicked by the Bishop as the Sisters had been. Their acts and the talk of the departing Sisters, together with the ignorance of the laity and the malice of many, made quite a sensation for a couple of weeks.

I would go through twice as much to bring about the change which has been effected. I shall now be able to have good parochial schools in this parish and in the city.

A school-house will be built in this parish, another in the Immaculate Conception, and a third in St. Bridget's this coming year. Thus, little by little, the disgrace which now hangs over us will be removed.

The Sisters of St. Joseph who are to be the Diocesan school teachers are doing very well, and promise great success in their work.⁶⁵

The erection of new school buildings and the formation of a Diocesan Teaching Sisterhood constituted only a part of the work planned. Bishop McQuaid also boldly attacked the Public School System's monopoly of support out of public taxes in two great lectures on *Free Christian Schools* which he delivered to overcrowded audiences in the Corinthian Hall, Rochester, December 8, 1870, and March 15, 1872. He championed the rights of parents whose conscience would not allow them to send their children to schools where there was no Catholic instruction, no Catholic atmosphere, and much less to schools that were either Protestant or infidel, such as were the public schools of the time. He cited copiously from Protestant ministers and educators who argued strongly for support of their denominational academies, to which their richer co-religionists sent their children to be trained in the religion of their parents as well as in secular learning. Bishop McQuaid, however, was working for the rank and file of his Catholic people, and it was in fairness to them that he asked for an extension of the Public School System so as to embrace also the parochial school.⁶⁶

My proposition would still have a system of State schools. It does not purpose to disintegrate, but to extend. It would bring the State back to the starting point of an elementary education, and on that basis takes a "new

⁶⁵ Bishops to M. A. C., 1865-1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

⁶⁶ Two speeches published at once separately in English and German, and together in 1892 plus (1) *The Public School Question as Understood by a Catholic Citizen* before the Free Religious Association, February 13, 1876; (2) *Religion in Schools*, *North American Review*, April, 1881; (3) *Religious Teaching in Schools*, *Forum*, December, 1889.

departure." Instead of the State having under its supervision only twenty schools, as here in Rochester, it would have a hundred and more; instead of having a limited number of teachers dependent on school commissioners and politicians only, there would be a much larger number dependent on the State for certificates for capacity and for results, and on the parents of the children for general success. Under the system proposed by me the State would have the right to decide on the fitness of the school building, furniture, etc., examine into the qualifications of teachers to impart a knowledge of the branches it pays for, fix the number of hours devoted to the study of these branches, inspect and examine the classes from time to time, and make such regulations as may be necessary to guard against abuses, misapplication of monies, etc. All schools receiving aid from the State should be under state supervision, leaving parents the liberty to regulate the management of the schools to which they elect to send their children after having complied with the requirements of the State.⁶⁷

While this earnest plea for an equitable share of the taxes paid to the State by Catholics as well as by Protestants and others bore no fruit, Bishop McQuaid soon gave practical proof that it was possible for the State to control secular education without any interference with the religious activity of the parochial school. He had occasion later to explain to Cardinal Ledochowski how this was done through the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

Unless I am mistaken, the State of New York is the only one of the United States which has such a board of Regents in charge of their educational system. They have under their care the colleges, academies, and schools of the State. They in no way interfere in the religious working of our Catholic institutions of learning; only if these wish to put themselves under the University they can do so, and complying with certain conditions can obtain a certificate, a diploma, or a degree in secular studies, the same as the non-Catholic institutions of learning in the State. In the year 1874, the parochial school of the Cathedral of Rochester was the first to take advantage of the Regents' examination and win for its pupils the State's certificate. Now, all over the State, Catholic schools and academies, in secular studies, equal and even surpass the non-Catholic institutions of the same grade. By voluntarily accepting this supervision of the State, which we can do without the sacrifice of any principle, there has been a marvellous improvement in teacher and pupils. There is no place for partiality or favoritism; the questions and matter for examination are prepared at the governmental offices in Albany where the Regents have their bureau of administration, and are sent to all schools and academies that apply for them, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. We receive no money or support from the State as the State schools receive, but it is our ambition to show to our people and to others that our schools are as good and better than the State schools, even by their own tests.⁶⁸

Bishop McQuaid could feel well satisfied with the results. Nevertheless, precisely at the time parochial school education was thus advantageously put under State control, he was vexed to find much lukewarmness even among the Catholic clergy for

⁶⁷ Bishop McQuaid to the Editor of the *Democrat and Chronicle*, March 22, 1872; *Union and Advertiser*, March 26, 1872.

⁶⁸ Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Ledochowski, c., February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

the cause of Catholic education. An impending decision on the matter by Rome was welcome news to him, as he wrote Archbishop Bayley, June 29. 1874:

I am glad that the moral duties of priests and parents with regard to Christian education of children are to be defined with some precision so that we may know exactly what course to follow. It is not pleasant to be put in the power of the hosts of young fledglings coming over from Rome bursting with conceit, or to be snubbed by laymen.

What you tell me about the practice in Rome surprises me exceedingly. Rome is always sound in theory but dreadfully loose in practice, once the difficulties of the theories come home to herself. If it be true that in Rome, where Catholic schools abound, Catholic parents can send their children to State schools such as they now have, I don't see how I can be justified in the course which I now follow. So soon as a parish is provided with ample school-room, good teachers, and free of costs, I refuse absolution to all parents who send their children to the public schools. Without approving of the High School, I do not refuse absolution to those who send there, as we have no school of corresponding grade.

The whole question will have to be settled on a well-defined basis up to which we shall have to live. I do not wish to be regarded as an extremist in my views, but, if I am right, some others are wrong. The expediency of agitating for our rights is another question. It would be better for us to be of one mind and work together. I do not see any prospect of bringing about unity of action, and I keep the discussion agoing in my own way wherever and whenever I can.⁶⁹

Bishop McQuaid's vigorous Catholic school policy was practically maintained in the *Instruction on Public Schools* issued by the Congregation of the Holy Office for the Bishops of the United States, November 24, 1875. Its concluding sentence made it expressly "manifest from Catholic moral teaching that parents, who neglect to impart to their children this necessary Christian education and training, or who allow them to frequent such schools in which the ruin of souls is inevitable, or finally who, when there is a suitable school in the place, fittingly furnished and equipped, or when they have the means of giving a Catholic education to their offspring elsewhere, nevertheless send their children to public schools, without sufficient reason, and without the necessary precautions, by which the proximate danger of perversion is made remote, cannot be absolved in the Sacrament of Penance."⁷⁰ This was more than enough for Bishop McQuaid, and he took occasion to emphasize the point in the pastoral which he published, October 4, 1878, on the eve of his departure for his visit *ad limina* in Rome.

No Catholic is in harmony with the Church who maintains opinions opposed to those teachings. It is absurd to say that one bishop more than

⁶⁹ Letters to Archbishop Bayley, No. 42, L to Z, Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

⁷⁰ *Collectanea S. Congregat. de Propag. Fide*, No. 481, pp. 204-5. Also *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. xi (1878), pp. 44-48.

another insists on the establishment of Catholic schools. It is not left with bishops to choose in this matter. They receive commands from an authority higher than their own, and know that their duty, based on their faith and conscience, obliges them to urge the maintaining of Catholic schools wherever it is possible. The false idea that one diocese has a law on the subject different from another needs correction. The bishop who fails to teach and enforce with pastoral zeal and vigilance the Church's law of Catholic schools for Catholic children, sins; the pastor of a flock who, being able, neglects to provide such a school for the young ones, the weak, the helpless, the greatly exposed, sins; the members of a parish who refuse to cooperate according to their means in the establishment of a Catholic School for their children, sin.

In the districts in which it is not possible to have a Catholic school, Catholic parents who have to make use of the common or public school, are obliged in conscience to make sure, by watchful examination and enquiry, that nothing is permitted in these schools contrary to Catholic faith and morals. To some extent they are protected in this right by the law of the State of New York, which forbids religious exercises of any kind during school hours. As any exercises that might be carried on by an over-zealous school teacher would necessarily be non-Catholic in character, Catholic parents are bound to guard their children from the efforts of these would-be proselytizers. Should the teachers and trustees be deaf to mild remonstrances, recourse must be had to the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York, whose duty it is to rebuke these bigots and breakers of the law.⁷¹

Bishop McQuaid's visit to Rome took place at a most critical moment in the development of the Catholic Church in America. Everlasting appeals to Rome seriously threatened episcopal government within the dioceses by undermining episcopal authority, and Rome was almost duped into legislating in favor of the Malcontents when Bishop McQuaid intervened "and then and there, by bold officiousness, staved off a great calamity of the American Church."⁷² He kept Bishop Corrigan well informed of the matter at the time, who wrote the Archbishop of Baltimore, February 1, 1879:

The Bishop of Rochester has been fighting our battle bravely before the S. Congregation. At Cardinal Simeoni's request, he has written one or two memorials (the third being his own). The most important came to hand last night and is now in the hands of my Metropolitan.

The chief issue is this, "Must a Prelate consult the Commission before making *any* transfer of a pastor from church to church, against the will of the latter?"

In Rome they had already decided *in the affirmative*, but postponed sending the answer. Meanwhile Bishop McQuaid was shown the letter all ready to be mailed, and begged a reconsideration of the question, or at least that the bishops here be written to before a final decision be made.

They asked him to remain in Rome until February 1, promising to have his Memorial printed, distributed to the Cardinals, and acted upon by that date. He sails from Liverpool, February 22.⁷³

⁷¹ Printed in pamphlet form by *Waterloo Catholic Times Press*.

⁷² Bishop McQuaid to Bishop Gilmour, April 12, 1885, *Cleveland Diocesan Archives*, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

⁷³ No. 46 C, Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

Bishop McQuaid's worst fears were excited; he was afraid that the new legislation "would inflict very great injury on the Church in this country."⁷⁴ He did not spare himself to avert the disaster, and fortunately was able to intervene sufficiently before sickness disabled him from taking further part in the conflict. The anxiety which his letters aroused in Bishop Corrigan was finally relieved by another letter written by Bishop McQuaid to him from Paris, March 29, 1879:

My strength is coming back gradually, and I have reason to hope that by the time I reach America I shall be myself again. I had a narrow escape.

However, I was compensated for all my sufferings by the success of the great question before the Sacred Congregation.

Until I got Cardinal Manning and the English bishops aroused, all seemed lost. Only two or three Cardinals of a dozen appeared inclined to take my view of the subject. Bilio was dead against us, and he is a power in the Congregation. My whole cry was for delay until the American bishops could be heard from. On my knees I begged the Holy Father not to permit this question to be settled without consulting the bishops of the U. S.

He enquired about the matter when I took leave of him, and showed great satisfaction when told that all was according to our wish.

I left Rome on the 11th of March. The day before the Congregation met and appointed Card. Simeoni and two others to draw up the letter of explanation of the "*Instructio*."⁷⁵

On his arrival at home, Bishop McQuaid soon recovered his full strength. He awaited the text of the important document with considerable impatience; when it did arrive, it gave him all the satisfaction he had desired. "The *Instructio* as explained," he wrote Bishop Corrigan, December 2, 1879, "is not the great thing that some disaffected priests looked for. Fixity of tenure and immunity of discipline were what they wanted. Bishops and people were to have no rights as against their claims."⁷⁶ The Roman document made it perfectly plain that the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, in regard to cases in which an ecclesiastical penalty or censure was to be inflicted or a grave disciplinary correction was to obtain, in no way altered or annulled the decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, No. 125 on the Nature of Missions, and Nos. 77 and 108 on the Juridical Effects of the Removal of Missionaries from Office. Bishops, however, were instructed not to remove priests from one mission to another against their will without a grave and reasonable cause. In case

⁷⁴ Bishop Corrigan to —, January 4, 1879. *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Bishops to M. A. C., 1865-1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

of a definitive removal of a rector from office because of a penalty to be inflicted for an offence, the Bishop was only to act after hearing his Council. Though its vote was only consultive, the opinion of the Council was always to be inserted in the process together with the minutes of the investigation. Nevertheless, bishops were not deprived of the power to proceed to suspension *ex informata conscientia*, provided they judged in the Lord that most grave and canonical causes concurred, or that a remedy had to be procured without hearing the Council because of grave and urgent necessity for the salvation of souls. Finally, each rector was free to bring with him before the Council another priest to witness the proceedings or to assist in his defence, but this priest had to be approved by the Bishop.⁷⁷

Neither the *Instructio* nor the *Responsa ad dubia* gave the bishops of the United States immunity from harassing appeals to Rome when they encountered trouble in their efforts to discipline recalcitrant members of their clergy. This condition of affairs, besides other things, made new conciliar legislation advisable in this country, and on February 27, 1883, Bishop McQuaid informed Bishop Gilmour of the preparatory work that he was doing for prospective legislation by a provincial council of New York: "I am now writing a long letter to Cardinal Simeoni asking for information on certain points connected with the *Instructio* and the *Responsa ad dubia*. I tell him that I do so as a member of the commission *de disciplina* preparing the matter for the Council; that I wish to clear up all difficulties for the correct and smooth working of the *Instructio*. His answers, if I can get them, will settle many things to our great comfort."⁷⁸ The Fourth Provincial Council of New York had been called for June 3,⁷⁹ but the bad health of the Cardinal, Archbishop McCloskey, made necessary its postponement till the following September.⁸⁰ The first solemn session was held Sunday, September 23. After the Solemn Mass in the presence of the Cardinal, Bishop McQuaid preached to the people on provincial councils.⁸¹ Even

⁷⁷ *Acta Sanctae Sedis*.

⁷⁸ Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Litterae Indictionis Concilii in Acta et Decreta Concil. Provin. IV Neoboracensis*, p. xv sq.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. xxx sq.

before the Council the legislation submitted to its discussion had received careful attention and criticism from bishops and theologians,⁸² and so the final work of the Council could be pushed on without being hampered by hardly any delay. The pastoral letter addressed to the laity by the united Episcopate of the Province, mainly the work of Bishop O'Farrell of Trenton,⁸³ insisted just as vigorously as Bishop McQuaid's Pastoral of 1878 on the uncompromising hostility of the Church to secret oath-bound societies and to "any system of public instruction from which religion is totally excluded."⁸⁴ These matters, as well as others affecting the laity, received full attention in the decrees of the Council, in the formulation of which no diversity of opinion was apparent. The same spirit of unanimity is also evident in the making of the decrees dealing with the life of the clergy, except in regard to one particular, the fifteenth Chapter, *De Vita Clericorum*,⁸⁵ which was amongst the matter apportioned to the congregation *De Personis Ecclesiasticis* under the presidency of Bishop McQuaid.⁸⁶ The chapter specified in great detail the *causa gravis et rationabilis* necessary for the removal of a rector from one mission to another even against the rector's will. The Cardinal in the fourth private congregation of the bishops, September 26, proposed the omission of this matter from the decrees of the Council, as it was to enter into the deliberations of the Metropolitan summoned to Rome for November to prepare for a National Council. The Bishop of Buffalo, however, thought it worth while to retain this matter, as thus would appear what was desired in this region. The Cardinal then consented to have the matter remain as it had been formulated on condition that a note be added to the effect that the article had been drawn up before the archbishops were summoned to Rome. This pleased all the bishops in the Provincial Council of New York.⁸⁷ The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore almost totally eclipsed this Fourth Provincial Council of New York, the proceed-

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. xxx: viii Coetus Praeparatorius Episcoporum et Theologorum.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. xxiv: vi Coetus Praeparatorius Epp.; p. xxxiv: x congregatio, privata epp. prima.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xlvii-lxviii.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 74 sq.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. xxxvi; cf. note, p. 74.

ings of which seem to have been pigeon-holed by the Propaganda. As late as January 18, 1886, Bishop McQuaid informed Archbishop Corrigan that he had written "a pretty sharp letter" to a friend resident in Rome "in relation to the ignoring of the Provincial Council of New York, giving permission to communicate its contents where they may do good."⁸⁸ Its Acts and Decrees were finally acted upon by the Congregation of the Propaganda, July 8, 1886, and approved by Pope Leo XIII three days later.⁸⁹

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore opened in the Cathedral of Baltimore, Sunday, November 9, and closed a month later, December 7, 1884. Its legislation is grouped together under eleven titles. Beginning with Faith, they deal with the Persons of the Church, Divine Worship, the Sacraments, the Training of the Clergy, the Education of the Catholic Youth, Christian Doctrine, Zeal for Souls, Church Property, Ecclesiastical Courts, and Ecclesiastical Burial. The Schema of legislation prepared under these heads by the Roman authorities with the help of the American archbishops was divided up and distributed among twelve deputations of theologians to pass through a committee stage before coming up for final action in the Plenary Council itself. Bishop McQuaid belonged to the Fourth Deputation under the presidency of Archbishop Corrigan, which had assigned to it the legislation on Regulars, the Faculty of Binating Mass, Uniformity in Feasts and Fasts, the Observance of Sunday, Sacred Music, and the Baptism of Converts. This covered all the matter of the Title on Divine Worship, the last chapter of the Title on the Persons of the Church, and the first chapter of the Title on the Sacraments.⁹⁰ The most important part of the legislation submitted to this Fourth Deputation was the chapter on Regulars. Bishop McQuaid had followed with keen interest the conflict between the English Hierarchy and the Regulars, which ended in the settlement of their mutual relations in the matter of church property by the Holy See in the Constitution "*Romanos Pontifices*," issued May 8, 1881.⁹¹ An

⁸⁸ *Bishops and Dignitaries*, 1886-1887, to M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

⁸⁹ Cf. *Decretum Recognitionis Concilii Provincialis Neo Eboracensis IV*, July 15, 1886, in *Acta et Decreta*, etc., p. xi.

⁹⁰ *Acta et Decreta Concil. Plen. Balt. III*, p. xxvi sqq.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 212 sqq.

extension of the provisions of this constitution to the Church of the United States was earnestly desired there, and the Holy See had already signified its readiness freely to grant a petition to that effect.⁹² Consequently the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Regulars was based primarily on this Constitution.⁹³ Thus the bishops of the United States profited of the labors of the English Hierarchy for a satisfactory settlement of a pressing question in various portions of this country.

The Plenary Sessions of the Council gave Bishop McQuaid the occasion to make his voice and vote tell in the settlement of many other points of legislation. Repeated visitations of his own diocese had made Bishop McQuaid familiar with them so that he could take part in the debate on the ceremonial to be followed in this work with advantages not possessed by many others.⁹⁴ When the right of suffrage for filling a vacancy in an episcopal see was considered in the Council, Bishop McQuaid was in favor of giving a vote in this matter also to the Chancellor, the Deans, the Rector of the Cathedral, and the Superiors of Seminaries,⁹⁵ but the approved decrees limited the proposition of three names for the vacant bishopric to the consultors and the irremovable rectors.⁹⁶ Both these classes of clerics occasioned considerable discussion in the Council. Though the Schema had *consensus* in some things, the bishops were unwilling to be dependant on the Diocesan Consultors for anything more than counsel, and Bishop McQuaid thought that their counsel was always to be given by them as a body.⁹⁷ When great reluctance was shown by the Council to the creation of irremovable rectors, the Bishop of Rochester gave testimony that he had advised the institution of such rectors in place of chapters when he was last in Rome.⁹⁸ The approved decrees made imperative the

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 47; cf. *Decretum Extensionis*, p. cv.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-49.

⁹⁴ [Private] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plen. Balt. Tertii*, p. xxix ad num. 18: Congregatio Prima Privata, Feria II, Die 10 November.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. lii: Congregat. 13 Privata, Feria II, Die 24 November.

⁹⁶ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 12, No. 15.

⁹⁷ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 4 Privata, Feria VI, Die 14 November ad. num. 23.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, Congregat. 8, Feria IV, Die 18 November, pp. xl-xliii.

creation of irremovable rectors within three years.⁹⁹ In this matter the bishops seemed especially fearful of the results as far as discipline was concerned. Malcontents had made every effort to claim irremovability even before the creation of irremovable rectors, and Bishop McQuaid in 1878-79, saved the day for the authority of bishops by obtaining a reconsideration of the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, in the *Responsa ad Dubia*. However, in 1884 these documents were superseded by another Instruction of the Propaganda, *Cum Magnopere*, which formed the basis of the new conciliar legislation submitted to the deliberation of the assembled prelates. A determined effort was made to escape the necessity of episcopal courts for the trial of clerics along the lines prescribed. Some held that the matter had been definitively settled by the Propaganda, but Bishop McQuaid, not without support from others, said that it was their right and duty to point out the difficulties under which the new method labored, which he thought would hardly bring the guilty to punishment.¹⁰⁰ Finally, the Archbishops of St. Louis, of Boston, and of Petra, the Bishops of Richmond, Rochester, and Trenton, and the Vicar-Apostolic of Dakota were appointed humbly to petition the Holy Father to have the old form of trials in clerical cases retained.¹⁰¹ Bishop McQuaid also took exception to the inquisitional methods recommended in the Schema for the extra-judicial procedure in the criminal cases of clerics; he recommended the substitution of other words designating an honest and legitimate investigation. The Archbishop of Boston also thought that some of the passage ought to be suppressed; he suggested that this part of the minutes of the Council should not be sent to Rome unless the petition of the Council for the retention of the old form of ecclesiastical trials was rejected by the Holy See. All voted the suggestion thus made, and for this reason a loose sheet was printed of this part of the minutes of the Council to be inserted or omitted from the copy to be presented to Rome according to circumstances.¹⁰² However, the authorities there insisted on the erection of the

⁹⁹ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 22, No. 35.

¹⁰⁰ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 26 Private, Feria V, 4 December. p. lxxxvi sq.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. xci.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, Quaedam ex Actis quae una cum Schemate Novo typis impresso vulgata non fuerunt. Cf. [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 176.

prescribed Episcopal Courts within three years after the promulgation of the Council, unless a further dispensation was obtained from the Propaganda. In this case the trial of clerics was to follow the procedure in the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, and its interpretation in the *Responsa ad dubia*.¹⁰³

The sad necessity of such legislation emphasized all the more the need of giving the best possible training to candidates for the Holy Priesthood in the Preparatory as well as in the Higher Seminary. The Schema even prescribed the establishment of villas to take care of the ecclesiastical students in the higher seminaries during the vacation. Bishop McQuaid took an active part in the discussion which led to a considerable modification of this part of the Schema. He did not believe in villas as the only means to preserve students, both before and after the reception of orders, immune from the danger of sin. Vacation was a time to test students to see what kind of priests they are going to make. This country's conditions were not those of Italy; our priests are thrown at once into the midst of dangers as soon as ordained, and they must have given proof before that they know how to conduct themselves in the world.¹⁰⁴ Despite his interest in ecclesiastical education and training, Bishop McQuaid begged to be excused from serving as a member of the Committee on Seminaries;¹⁰⁵ he vigorously criticized, however, the failure of the Schema to put more emphasis on the study of English;¹⁰⁶ he failed finally to reorganize his own Preparatory Seminary in accordance with the new legislation, as he thought "the Plenary Council enjoined a course of studies and demanded an excellence of attainment simply impossible in nine cases out of ten."¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, Bishop McQuaid later wrote in terms of highest commendation of this part of the work done by the Council.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore has decreed largely and in detail what courses of study are to be followed in these two Seminaries, the preparatory and the higher. These courses cover the ground well. The Council

¹⁰³ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 170 sq, Nos. 297 and 298.

¹⁰⁴ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 16 Privata, Feria IV, 26 November, p. lix.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, November 24, p. liii.

¹⁰⁶ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 15 Privata, Feria III, die 25 November, p. lvi.

¹⁰⁷ Bishop McQuaid to Rev. —. Inclosed in letter to Bishop Gilmour, February 20, 1887. Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

decrees that not less than six years shall be spent in following them. Perhaps the Council was in advance of its day in prescribing six full years; then it could not have meant seriously that the course of study it mapped out should be completed in less time. The chapter on our higher Seminaries is overflowing with wise prescriptions for conduct and studies. Its courses of studies are much the same as are followed in the Propaganda and the best schools in Rome; they are the same as the studies insisted on in all the higher seminaries lately sanctioned by the Sacred Congregation of Studies in Padua, in Spain, Mexico, and Maynooth, with the annexed condition of conferring academic degrees on their successful students. There is no reason to suppose that the same privilege will be withheld from other well-organized Seminaries asking for it.¹⁰⁸

In fact one of the reasons of Bishop McQuaid's opposition to the Catholic University at Washington was the endeavor of its first promoters to make the faculty of giving degrees a monopoly of that institution. He felt that "this is too big a country, with a marvellous growth year by year, to be restricted by such fetters as it was proposed to put on the Church in these U. S."¹⁰⁹ Moreover, Bishop McQuaid then thought the Diocesan Seminary the question of the hour in ecclesiastical education in America.

It is at this time that some are calling aloud for the establishment of a grand Catholic University, and of a Theological Seminary for extended and higher studies. An essential condition preparatory to the founding of such a university is to know that there are young men willing and ready to take advantage of its facilities of a university course of study. A second condition lies in the getting together of a large sum of money sufficient to place the University on a solid financial basis. A University, in a rich country like America, cannot go abegging among the poor and rich; Catholics show no inclination to rival non-Catholics by endowing educational institutions. We must wait and pray for a change in both respects before the dream of a Catholic University, except in name, can be realized.

The founding of a Theological School for higher studies is more feasible and is nearer at hand than that of the University. It may lead the way to the University. But antecedent to the founding of this Theological University will be the establishing of Diocesan Seminaries to answer the ordinary and usual wants of a diocese and to serve as feeders to the higher school. This is the primary necessity, and is according to the mind of the Church and the instructions of Rome.

This was written in the Pastoral on the Seminary Collection, August 20, 1882, and it is remarkable how closely the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore assembled two years later parallels these suggestions of Bishop McQuaid in the chapter of its decrees *De Seminario Principali*, from which, as from a seed, the University was to grow.¹¹⁰ When the promoters of the University went beyond the decrees of the Council, opposition naturally arose, and even increased in strength, as policies were espoused

¹⁰⁸ BISHOP MCQUAID, *Our American Seminaries*, in the *Am. Eccl. Rev.*, May, 1887, p. 467 *sq.*

¹⁰⁹ Bishop McQuaid to —, December 28, 1887. Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

¹¹⁰ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*, p. lxxix; [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 93.

by University men hostile to Bishop McQuaid's thought and life. Unfortunately, for instance, the Parochial School System vigorously championed at the Catholic University of Washington today was not always a cause so strongly espoused there. Despite this and actual financial ruin so often prophesied by Bishop McQuaid, every Catholic today would be pleased to see the University develop into a great institution of learning, productive of scholarly dissertations and reviews of the rank and grade attained by the great Catholic universities of Europe.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore was itself emphatic enough on the Catholic school question. Obligatory attendance, however, at the parochial school also raised some discussion there. Bishop McQuaid denied the existence of any obligation of the kind, if there were no suitable Catholic school. However, if there were such a school, parents transgressing the law might rightly be refused the Sacraments.¹¹¹ The final decrees of the Council not only urged, but commanded parents to send their children to the parochial school unless the Ordinary allowed otherwise in a particular case.¹¹² There was, nevertheless, no intention to claim a monopoly of Catholic education for the parochial school. For the Archbishop of Philadelphia judged any school to be Catholic in which persons of Catholic faith and life taught Christian doctrine besides letters; Bishop McQuaid desired the establishment of many schools of this kind.¹¹³ The Council naturally left it to the judgment of the Ordinary to determine what school was a Catholic school.¹¹⁴

The Council also gave thought to the improvement of Catholic journalism. Bishop McQuaid was appointed to the committee in charge of the matter.¹¹⁵ The public decrees of the Council recommended one paper for each province to be supported financially by the Bishops of the Province if need be. A Catholic daily was also recommended for each large city, though it was not neces-

¹¹¹ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 17 Privata, Feria IV, Die 26 Novem-ber, p. lxii.

¹¹² [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 100sq, No. 196.

¹¹³ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 18 Privata, Feria VI, Die 28 Novem-ber, p. lxiv.

¹¹⁴ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 104, No. 199.

¹¹⁵ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 20 Privata, Sabbato, Die 29 Novem-ber P. M.

sary to go by the name of Catholic, provided it judiciously seized the occasion to defend Catholic doctrine from attack and calumny, and carefully kept from its readers news unfit to be read.¹¹⁶ Past experience made the prelates of the Council warn the faithful against newspaper writers who claim the name Catholic for their organs, but use their opportunities to discredit the authorities governing the Church.¹¹⁷ Writers of that character did not hesitate at times even to make use of the secular press for the same purpose. This, in fact, was the reason why Bishop McQuaid waxed indignant at the doings of a press agent in reporting to the *New York Sun* a discussion on church revenue within the Council in a way to put the action of some of the prelates in an odious light.¹¹⁸ Although the reporter touched upon most of the points in the discussion, he omitted to mention one that was much debated on this occasion, namely, dancing connected with banquets for the promotion of pious works. Contrary to the opinions advanced by some, yet not without support from others, Bishop McQuaid declared that there was danger latent in passing too many and too rigorous laws. He thought that dancing could be safely indulged in, out in the country, under due safeguards, as otherwise the young folk would attend the dances of non-Catholics.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, the Council finally ordered priests to see to the total abolition of all banquets with balls for the promotion of pious works.¹²⁰

Greater freedom was taken by the Council with the first chapter of Title VIII, which was originally headed "Of Italian Immigrants." It precipitated an earnest discussion that led to the significant change of this chapter to the more general title "Of Colonists and Immigrants." Bishop McQuaid and others thought that the whole chapter of the original Schema ought to be expunged; he saw no reason why they should be so solicitous of the Italians; care must be taken of all immigrants. Finally, a committee, composed of Archbishops Corrigan and Riordan, the

¹¹⁶ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 126, No. 227.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 129, No. 231.

¹¹⁸ Copied from the *Sun* into the *London Tablet*. Cf. Bishop McQuaid to January 28, 1886. Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

¹¹⁹ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 25 Privata, Feria IV, Die 3 December P. M., p. lxxxvi.

¹²⁰ [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 167, No. 290.

Bishops of Rochester, Peoria, and New Orleans, was appointed to rewrite the whole chapter.¹²¹ A little later these prelates reported that they could speak but despairingly of Italian colonists, for whom no help could be hoped except through societies established in Italy itself. They therefore recommended writing to the Holy Father a clear statement of the whole Italian situation in this country.¹²² Special care had also to be taken of the Negroes and Indians. The expenses of this work were to be provided for by a collection. Bishop McQuaid thought it better to have two collections in churches, one for these missions and the other for the parish, although, if the matter were understood by the people and only one collection was taken up, he thought a part of the collection might be retained for the church.¹²³ To expedite matters, the Archbishop of Cincinnati and the Bishop of Rochester advised the formation of a commission of prelates having Indians and Negroes in their dioceses; let them come to an agreement under the presidency of the Archbishop of San Francisco and form a law to be approved by the Council. This was also done.¹²⁴ Finally, under this Title VIII, the Council also dealt with the danger to Catholics from secret societies. The difficulty was to determine what societies were of this character. This was precisely the reason why there was so much discussion on the standing of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Bishop McQuaid proposed a settlement of the question by the appointment of three bishops with instructions to inquire into the nature and character of this society and to report the results of their investigation to the Council. The Archbishops of Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco were appointed to do this work, with whom then the Archbishop of Baltimore was also associated.¹²⁵ Bishop McQuaid referred thus to the results in writing later to Archbishop Corrigan:

The Council very peremptorily declined to act in the matter under the suggestion of the Archbishops of Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco, relegating the whole question to a committee composed of the archbishops of the country. Without their united action, as I understand

¹²¹ [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat, 21 Privata, Feria II, Die 1 December, p. lxxi sq.

¹²² *Ibid.*, Congregat. 27 Privata, Feria V, Die 4 December, P. M., p. xcii.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, Congregat. 21 Privata, Feria II, Die 1 December, p. lxxv.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, Congregat. 29 Privata, Feria VI, Die 5 December, P. M., p. xcvi.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, Congregat. 22 Privata, Feria II, 1 December, P. M., p. lxxviii.

the decision of the Council, nothing could be done. It is the *reserved privilege* of the archbishops, not individually, but in concert and in a body to examine and decide this question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the A. O. H. . . . I sought the assistance of the Council in putting an end to diversity of conduct on the part of bishops toward the A. O. H. The Council chose in preference to bury the business where I am inclined to think it will be buried.¹²⁶

On the conclusion of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, it was necessary to obtain the approbation of Rome before the decrees could be promulgated as the law of the American Church. There was considerable misgiving about the action Rome would take in regard to some of the modifications of the Schema submitted to the Council for legislation. Bishops Dwenger and Moore were finally selected as envoys to present the Acts and Decrees of the Council to the authorities at Rome and to work for their approval, although there had been some talk of sending Bishops McQuaid and Gilmour. However, Bishop McQuaid wrote the latter, December 27, 1884: "I felt quite certain that after my action in the Ancient Order case I would be considered a dangerous man to send to Rome by their Graces of St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Chicago. I think they and others are a little afraid of me. Perhaps it is just as well for me not to go, but if Archbishop Corrigan and yourself could go, some good would certainly come out of your representation. If we cannot have a strong representation in members of our body, it would be better to have no one there. It will not answer for anyone to go unless officially. He would be snubbed and sent home. But we can write. I propose to write at length to Cardinal Simeoni soon after the departure of our envoys."¹²⁷ Under considerable pressure Bishop Gilmour was finally also duly accredited, and providentially so. Bishop Dwenger proved hopelessly unfit for the work; Bishop Moore lacked initiative, but ably seconded the efforts of Bishop Gilmour, who saved an important portion of the work of the Council by a direct appeal to the Holy Father.¹²⁸

Soon after this Rome put Bishop McQuaid in charge of a case that gave him another opportunity to render signal services to the American Church. He informed Bishop Gilmour of it,

¹²⁶ March 15, 1886. *Bishops and Dignitaries, 1886-1887*. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

¹²⁷ Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

¹²⁸ Bishop Gilmour to Bishop McQuaid, November 5, 1885. *Ibid.*, *Letters*, Vol. v, October 3, 1884, to January 11, 1887; also *Protest of Bishops Moore and Gilmour*, October 3, 1885. *Ibid.*, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

January 14, 1886: "Rome sent me a case of a priest in the diocese of Albany against the parish where he had formerly been pastor to adjudicate definitely and without appeal. It has been in dispute about fourteen years. It has been and is still before the civil courts. Before taking up the case I required the plaintiff to withdraw the case from the secular courts. Of course he refused. So I sent back the case to Rome, as there was in this country a higher court than that of Rome to which recalcitrant priests might appeal against unfavorable sentences of ecclesiastical courts."¹²⁹ Bishop McQuaid pursued the matter further in writing to Bishop Gilmour, February 9, 1886: "You will do me and yourself a favor by sending me the names of priests that have within a few years past brought their bishops into the *civil* courts, either against them personally or churches under their care. Names, approximate dates at least, and leading features of the case; a few lines will suffice. I want to present as formidable an array as possible to Rome to lead to special legislation on this subject. I will write to half a dozen bishops that I can trust."¹³⁰ When the Memorial for Rome was duly prepared, Bishop Gilmour received a summary of its contents, April 17, 1886.

It is a long document containing American law on the subject, twenty cases of clerics suing bishops and church corporations, the scandals arising therefrom, and the heavy expenses incurred from such suits.

The whole mischief has come from a faulty interpretation put on the 156th decree of the Second Plenary Council by our learned *American Canonists*. I write that if the 84th decree of the Third means no more than the other thus interpreted, the evil will grow in magnitude. It is quite sure, however, that Rome will come out with a very strong letter of Instruction, similar to the one published by the Sacred Penitentiary (?) through Cardinal Monaco, bearing date January 23, 1886, which no doubt you have seen.¹³¹

Bishop McQuaid's expectations were fully realized. On July 13, 1886, Cardinal Simeoni wrote him the decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, which plainly declared that it would never admit the recourse or appeal of priests who dared to cite before lay judges either a cleric without the permission of the Ordinary or a bishop without the permission of the Holy See, whether in an ecclesiastical cause or not, unless they first abandoned the recourse taken to the civil court. According to the explanation of the chapter *Cogentes*, published by the

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 4, No. A, etc.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

Congregation of the Inquisition, January 23, 1886, bishops can punish such clerics with penalties and censures *ferendae sententiae*, especially with suspension *a divinis*. If Ordinaries are asked for permission to convene a cleric before a lay court, they are not to refuse it, especially when they have tried in vain to settle the dispute between the parties contending.¹³² This reply suited Bishop McQuaid, and on August 2, 1886, he wrote Bishop Gilmour: "I am acting on it in the case of O'Sullivan *vs.* St. Mary's Church of Hudson. It will cover the case of Early *vs.* St. Patrick's Church of Rochester. It turns out that his bishop is backing him bravely. I have always felt that Bishop Ryan was at the bottom of my trouble, but others are beginning to see it as well."¹³³ Bishop McQuaid had already written Bishop Gilmour the great general results he expected from the Propaganda's decision: "It will put a stop to civil suits in the future except by scalawags who condemn the Church."¹³⁴

This did not end trouble between bishops and priests within the Church itself. Bishop McQuaid's main difficulty was Father Lambert, a man who had put not only Catholics but also positive Protestants deeply in debt to himself by his famous *Notes on Ingersoll*. A *Thesaurus Biblicus* with other writings, editorial labors on his own Waterloo paper, *The Catholic Times*, on the *Philadelphia Catholic Times*, finally on the *Freeman's Journal*, gave Father Lambert a prominent literary standing before the American public. In the Diocese of Rochester, however, since Bishop McQuaid's return from Rome in 1879, Father Lambert became an active factor in fostering trouble for the head of the diocese, sometimes openly, but more often secretly and insidiously. His conduct finally led Bishop McQuaid to confine his sphere of activity within the Diocese to very narrow limits by a letter dated April 7, 1881:

I hereby restrict the exercise of your faculties to the limits of your mission of Waterloo.

I also direct you not to be present at any other 40 hours' devotion than your own.

For placing these restrictions on you there are excellent reasons which render them advisable and even necessary.¹³⁵

¹³² *Acta et Decreta Concil. Provin. Neo Eboracen*, IV, p. 85 sq.

¹³³ Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

¹³⁴ Same to same, July 26, 1886. *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ New York Archdiocesan Archives, Metropolitan New York, Archbishop's House.

Father Lambert's appeal to the Cardinal Archbishop of New York, April 9, 1881, was not more successful than his appeal to the Propaganda three years later. The very next day after Bishop McQuaid received this decision from Rome, he informed Bishop Gilmour of its substance December 17, 1884: "The Bishop is not obliged to grant faculties to a priest for the whole diocese; and can consequently limit them to a particular mission."¹³⁶ Father Lambert now waited till March 20, 1888, before he again had recourse to Rome. Then he addressed his letter of complaint to Cardinal Simeoni, the Prefect of the Propaganda. The latter naturally corresponded with Bishop McQuaid, who finally put down his own demands in the case, May 16, 1888:

1. Rev. Mr. Lambert must apologize to the Vicar-General of the Diocese and to the former Rector of the Cathedral for the insults offered them in his newspaper.

2. He must acknowledge before the priests of the Diocese that he did not know that I was the writer of the articles signed "A Catholic," and consequently that he did not intend to designate me as a *Tartuffe*, an immoral hypocrite.

3. A transfer to another mission is demanded in behalf of the temporal and spiritual interests of his present charge.

4. A check upon his disposition to form parties and create factions in the diocese is necessary.

5. In view of the fact that Rev. Mr. Lambert was never properly released from Alton, the diocese of his ordination, it would be better for him to go back to it, or if this arrangement cannot be made, let him go to some other diocese for whose bishop he may be able to have more respect than he has for the Bishop of Rochester.¹³⁷

The reply from Rome was anything but what had been expected by Father Lambert and his expert adviser, Dr. Burtzell. Cardinal Simeoni sent his letter, dated July 31, 1888, to Father Lambert through Bishop McQuaid. The Prefect of the Propaganda wrote:

After receiving your appeal against the Bishop of Rochester, opportune information was gathered which has furnished elements sufficient for pronouncing judgment. Already in August, 1884, a letter was sent to you setting aside your claim, and now after your last deductions the decision then rendered is in no way to be modified. However, there are many reasons for not receiving your appeal. Among those which might be adduced, it will suffice to note the following. You know well that those ordained "*titulo missionis*" must obtain the permission of this Sacred Congregation in order to be released from their diocese and admitted into another, as appears from a decree of this same Congregation given on the 4th of February, 1873, and transcribed in the Appendix of the III Council of Baltimore, page 210. If one thus ordained *titulo missionis* has taken the oath to serve a certain diocese, then the simple permission of the Sacred Congregation does not suffice, but a dispensation must then be obtained. Now from the documents transmitted by you to this Sacred Congregation it does not appear that you have fulfilled the afore-

¹³⁶ Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

¹³⁷ Original draft in my possession.

said prescriptions and of a consequence you are not legally incorporated in the Diocese of Rochester, but remain as yet bound to the Diocese of Alton. Affairs standing thus, you have no right to advance any complaint against Monsignor McQuaid's method of procedure in your regard.¹³⁸

As soon as Bishop McQuaid had ascertained the fact that Father Lambert had been ordained for the Alton Diocese and had not obtained the permission of the Propaganda to change to another diocese, he dismissed Father Lambert from the Diocese of Rochester.¹³⁹ When Father Lambert pursued his case personally at Rome, whither Bishop McQuaid had also gone for this business as well as for his decennial visit *ad limina*, the Propaganda had to admit a legal mistake in applying to Father Lambert's case a law which had been passed years after his ordination. Otherwise Bishop McQuaid had a strong case against Father Lambert, who failed to be reinstated in Waterloo, and had to make an act of submission, but in rather general terms: "Hereby I retract fully and without reserve whatever I have written directly or indirectly against the said Rt. Rev. Bishop, and hereby I want to repair the scandal in this my act of retraction of the said writings."¹⁴⁰

Even this did not stop Father Lambert's old tactics of covert attacks and insinuations against Bishop McQuaid. One of these had to do with the Bishop's attitude towards the newly established Apostolic Delegation at Washington. Before its actual establishment Bishop McQuaid was not in favor of such an institution. As early as February 15, 1877, he wrote Bishop Corrigan:

The "Apostolic Delegate" business is a very serious one, and one destined to make trouble if followed up. Instead of keeping our warm love for Rome, it will have a contrary effect. The only reason for the change that I have heard has been to lessen appeals to Rome. Will he lessen them? I doubt it. But he will have complied with certain forms of procedure better than bishops now comply with them, Rome will have to take into account our peculiar condition and adapt her regulations to it. The attempt to carry out the requirements of the *old* canon law will end in disaster to religion. Protestants now congratulate us on our method of washing our dirty linen at home and out of sight of strangers. Of course priests have a right to justice, and to exemption from injustice on the part of a bishop, old, feeble, or likely to be

¹³⁸ Copy of original in my possession; cf. *Lambert's Summarium*, p. 38 sq.

¹³⁹ Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Simeoni, October 15, 1888. Original draft in my possession.

¹⁴⁰ MENGHINI, *Memorial to the Propaganda*, p. 2; copy in my possession. Cf. an interesting review of the case, hostile to Bishop McQuaid, by Dr. Edward McGlynn in his Address on *Father Lambert, A Priest Who Went to Rome and What He Got There*, delivered before the Anti-poverty Society, 27 Cooper Union, New York City, July 28, 1889, published in the Society's Addresses No. 42, Friday, August 2, 1889.

deceived when trusting to his own judgment. The more quiet the way in which the examination or trial takes place, the better for religion and the priest, provided the latter has been sufficiently protected against a mistaken or false judgment.

Has Rome any conception of our difficulty in obtaining evidence against an accused priest among the Irish people? . . . Witnesses who are willing to appear before a bishop will not present themselves before a body of priests. At least let Rome proceed cautiously before imposing on us an iron clad form to go by . . . So if you have an opportunity, give them some plain talk. They hear too much that is according to their own preconceived notions of what ought to be, and not enough of the unpleasant truths concerning our actual condition and difficulties. An "Apostolic Delegate" will in my judgment be an unmitigated misfortune. Sycophants will gather around him and use him. Let us be as we are. Still I hold that justice demands that a priest should have a right to a trial by his brother priests whenever accused of a crime for which the bishop proposes to punish him. The mode of this trial makes the difficulty.¹⁴¹

The very next year Bishop McQuaid wrote to a prominent American prelate from Rome, December 10, 1878: "My repugnance to a permanent Delegate arises from other reasons chiefly than the one you name. The political reason is a strong one, but the other reasons weigh more with me. I will use all judicious efforts with all suitable persons from the Pope down to put a stop to this Delegate arrangement."¹⁴² When, however, Bishop McQuaid heard a little later that another Delegate would be sent to Canada, "who will also be commissioned to take a look at things in the U. S., but without any official character in our country," he declared: "I do not blame the Propaganda for sending these agents inasmuch as no one says a word against their doing so, while some American bishops favor the plan. To me it is most offensive, but I have not spoken against it because of the unofficial character he is to hold."¹⁴³ The "Delegate business" apparently went into abeyance for a time. During the preparations for the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore some misgiving was felt lest a foreigner be appointed to preside over it, and it was with considerable satisfaction to many that the Archbishop of Baltimore was appointed to that position with the rank of Apostolic Delegate. After the Council the issue became vital again. Bishop Dwenger was then mentioned as a candidate. Bishop McQuaid "did not at first intend to do aught. I was simply disgusted with the whole affair. . . . However, for the honor of

¹⁴¹ Bishops to M. A. C., 1865-1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

¹⁴² Baltimore Cathedral Archives, No. 55.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

the Holy See I did write a letter to Rome which may serve to open people's eyes with regard to the fitness of the candidate." A little later Bishop McQuaid declared: "Dwenger's chance is not great. It was the intention of Rome to appoint him, but I think that a change has come over them in the Eternal City."¹⁴⁴ When Bishop Gilmour made known his candidates for the position, Rochester, Boston, or New York, Bishop McQuaid replied with a touch of humor: "There is less chance of my appointment [than Dwenger's]; so I do not worry. I am too pleasantly situated where I am to covet any other position or more responsibility. Still I thank you for your good opinion of my humble self. Boston or New York would be the right man."¹⁴⁵ For Bishop Gilmour's benefit Bishop McQuaid cited, February 20, 1887, a pertinent passage from a letter of one of his Roman correspondents of good authority. This personage wrote: "I do not consider it likely from the appearance of things at present that the Delegate will be an American. The idea seems to be to erect in the U. S. a branch of the Propaganda as is done for Turkey, to be presided over by one of themselves. For the present the branch would have no diplomatic character, and very likely its first seat will not be Washington in order to excite no fears."¹⁴⁶ Bishop McQuaid quite agreed with Bishop Gilmour "that the 'branch' will be established here with an Italian at its head. They want to see with their own eyes, so they say. Anything would be better than Dwenger."¹⁴⁷ Finally, after some years an Apostolic Delegation was established at Washington with no official political standing and with Msgr. Satolli at its head. The expense of building a fitting home for the establishment naturally fell to the lot of the American Catholic Church, and the following characteristic letter gives proof of Bishop McQuaid's earnest cooperation in the work.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., *April 12, 1894.*

Most Eminent Cardinal:

At the close of the last year I addressed a letter to the priests of Rochester diocese of which I inclose your Eminence a copy.

Early in February a check for \$600 was sent, but as no receipt has come

¹⁴⁴ Bishop McQuaid to Bishop Gilmour, January 26 and 31, 1887. Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, January 31, 1887.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, February 20, 1887.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, February 25, 1887.

back, it is safe to say that the letter has miscarried. A duplicate check is now mailed, wishing it better luck.

In establishing a pro-rata for this diocese and for the churches in the diocese I assumed that the Catholic population of the country was at least 8,000,000. It is generally estimated at from ten to twelve millions. Six and a quarter mills on eight millions will give the fifty thousand dollars needed. The smallest Catholic population in any diocese will be found to be in North Carolina and Cheyenne, each having about 3,000. The pro-rata for each, at $6\frac{1}{4}$ mills, would be \$18.75. The poorest diocese could pay this amount without much sacrifice.

It is a great pity that the Archbishops at their meeting in Chicago did not determine on the arrangement they have now come to. What might have been brought about at once now drags along and much will never be gathered in satisfactorily.

Your Eminence will remember that in my letter asking for information as to the cost of the Delegation-House, I stated what I proposed to do. In making known its cost you also expressed approval of the plan. The Cath. Pop. of this diocese is not over 80,000. At $6\frac{1}{4}$ mills our pro-rata would be \$500. I have put the amount at \$600. The extra \$100 will pay for North Carolina, Saint Augustine, and Charleston.

When the inclosed circular letter was sent to the priests of the diocese, although the heading made it a private letter, Rev. Mr. Lambert, whom my brother bishops have been busy patting on the back ever since he gave exhibition of coarse blackguardism in assaults on his own bishop, in the style of Phelan of the *Western Watchman*, published in the *Catholic Times* of Philadelphia the latter part of the letter, criticising very severely my method of raising this fund for the Delegation-House.

I am glad that it is the only way in which the money can be got together.

I have the honor to remain,

Your Eminence's Obt. Servt.

B. J. MCQUAID.¹⁴⁸

This generous liberality on the part of Bishop McQuaid is all the more striking, as he had more than one reason to complain of the conduct of the first Apostolic Delegate, who for a time was under the influence of persons taking advantage of their position of trust to mislead him. Worst of all was the crisis he precipitated in the Catholic School Question. When Bishop McCloskey of Louisville read the text of his communication to the Archbishops of the United States, he honestly confessed to Archbishop Corrigan, December 8, 1892: "I fear that, if authoritative, it is the death blow to a certain extent of our Catholic schools."¹⁴⁹ Bishop McQuaid expressed the same conviction in writing to the same Archbishop, December 13, 1892:

We are all in a nice pickle, thanks to Leo XIII and his delegate.

Just as our arduous work of the last forty years was beginning to bear ample fruit, they arbitrarily upset the whole. If an enemy had done this!

Yesterday an English translation of Mgr. Satolli's address to the Archbishops came to hand. Apparently it was sent from Philadelphia from a priest who has differed with me on the School Question.

It is only a question of time, when present Roman legislation having

¹⁴⁸ Letters to —, Baltimore Cathedral Archives, No. 55, Mc.

¹⁴⁹ 1892. Bishops to M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

wrought incalculable mischief, that we, school-children of the hierarchy, will again receive a lesson in our Catechism from another Italian sent out to enlighten us.

The lessons of Satolli's pamphlet (private and confidential) do not apply to the diocese of Rochester where the parochial schools are not only equal but much superior to the public schools.

The Professor in Faribault, whose communication to the *Christian Union* is published in the last number of the *Catholic Herald*, together with the description of the Stillwater school which appeared in the *Chicago Herald*, ought to be translated into Italian, and sent in large numbers to Rome. Joined to this publication should be extracts from Archbishop Ireland's *Memorial*. It would show the good people over there how shamefully they were led astray by misrepresentations.¹⁵⁰

Things were not so bad as they first looked to zealous promoters of the Catholic Parochial School System. Leo XIII sent a letter to the United States, asking the prelates of the Catholic Church for their opinion on the school question. Bishop McQuaid's answer is dated January 16, 1893, and representations such as advanced in this letter saved the Catholic schools from the disaster that seemed to be threatening them. Bishop McQuaid wrote:

I thank your Holiness for the opportunity given me to write upon a subject that gravely concerns the spiritual welfare of our Catholic people in the United States, and about which their minds and souls are at present greatly disturbed.

After the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore we had peace in the Church, and all, bishops, priests, and people, seemed intent on promoting the establishment of Catholic schools as rapidly as possible. The first note of alarm came from a dangerous address delivered at St. Paul before a Convention of State School Teachers. This address of Archbishop Ireland pained and bewildered all who had followed carefully the School Question as it has been discussed in America. Already many efforts had been made to effect a compromise with the State on a basis that would protect the faith and morals of our Catholic children. These efforts have invariably failed of adequate success. On such a basis as that of Faribault and Stillwater, actually put into effect in those towns, it would be easy in many places to bring about an adoption of our Catholic schools as State or Public Schools, but it would be by a complete sacrifice of the Catholic education and training of our children.

The only arrangement that is now possible between the State and Church on this question is one that entirely surrenders our rights, and that puts our schools on a par with the State Schools from which the inculcation of morals based on religious motives is altogether excluded. Whenever the Catholic Church is ready to substitute the natural for the supernatural in religion the time will have arrived for passing over our Schools to State control.

What we have most of all to dread is not the direct teaching of the State Schools, it is the indirect teaching which is the most insidious and the most dangerous. It is the moral atmosphere, the tone of thought permeating these schools that give cause for alarm. It is the indifferentism with regard to all religious beliefs we most of all fear. This is the dominant heresy that, imbibed in youth, can scarcely ever be eradicated. It is one that already has in our large towns and cities decimated Protestant churches. It is one that will decimate our churches if not checked in time. Indifferentism with regard to all religious ends is rank infidelity.

Associations in schools, especially in State schools, where all classes, Protestants, Jews, and Infidels, meet promiscuously, present another danger.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

In a State school all the children of these classes living within the school district are to be found. Watchful Christian parents would never allow their children to associate with such at other times, justly fearing contamination. Yet in State schools their children sit on the same benches with them, and meet them on the playground. Many Protestant parents refuse to send their children to State schools on account of this exposure, preferring private schools. Catholic children in attendance at Catholic schools frequent the sacraments regularly, especially Penance, in which a safeguard is found for purity. When not in Catholic schools experience has shown that only a small number, and these of pious families, can be brought to confession. Other children, not Catholic, have no such protection for morality and esteem purity under a laxer system of intercourse between the sexes as less sacred. These associations, ripening into friendships, lead in time to mixed marriages, the growing evil of our time and country.

Experience has also demonstrated that Catholic children brought up in State schools lose the spirit of the Catholic religion; their thoughts and speech are tinged with a liberalism that borders on infidelity. A common remark among this class is: All religions are good enough or one religion is as good as another.

I speak with knowledge derived from an experience of forty-five years in the priesthood in this my native country, of which nearly twenty-five have been in the episcopate. The maintenance of Catholic schools demands of bishops, priests, and people great sacrifices, much labor, and a large expenditure of money. I have always believed that the cause of Catholic education was worthy of such sacrifices. I believe it all the more strongly now that I have read what your Holiness says to the Italian people in the Encyclical of December 8.

For many years past I have felt that in this country the Catholic school was as necessary for the children as the church was for them and their parents. For although the chief mission of the Church is to preach the Gospel of Christ, yet there is little likelihood of that Gospel reaching and abiding in the hearts of the children except through the instrumentality of the schoolhouse. Indeed it will be useless to build churches that in one or two generations hence will be vacant because children or grandchildren of European parents no longer follow the religion of their ancestors. If the Church in the United States has already lost so many of her children, it is due in large degree to the want of Catholic schools.

I also beg your Holiness to note that, in discussing the question of State or Government in America, it is necessary to bear in mind that the State, in so far as it is an executive body for the administration of the political affairs of the country, is a creature of the people, and it cannot go counter to the wishes and will of the people. Hence until the people are educated up to a sense of rendering justice to their Catholic fellow-citizens in their schools, it is useless to appeal to what is called the State or Government. In certain localities people may be more intelligent and more just and better disposed to admit our right to provide a Christian education for our children than in others. Just yet the people at large are not prepared to concede to us our just rights, while they are much more so than they were twenty or fifty years ago. The acceptance from them of anything less than our full rights, except as a temporary compromise, would be a misfortune for the church in America. There should be no compromise at any time that sacrifices the right of our children to a Christian education.

With the remarks respectfully offered to your Holiness, I now proceed to animadvert on the fourteen propositions of Mgr. Satolli placed before the Archbishops on the 17th of November last [1892].

1. Of the first five propositions, which are taken from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, remark need to be made only on the 5th. This is a portion of the paragraph in which it is found, and by omitting the preceding part conveys the idea that under no circumstances can absolution be refused to parents who persist in sending their children to State schools. This is the interpretation put on it by the Protestant newspapers of the country, which rejoice greatly at the victory gained in their favor. It is also received favorably by Catholic priests and people who side with the prevailing liberalism of

the day. If it is the correct interpretation, then all further argument is of no avail, and the sooner we abandon all effort to save religion the better. But I do not believe that this is the mind of the Holy See, and for the following reasons:

(a) The contrary is taught in the *Instructio* of November 24, 1875.
 (b) There is always great danger to faith and morals in public schools from which all religion is excluded, if not from the direct teaching, then from association with the classes that frequent the State schools.

(c) Scarcely ever do parents, who place their children in State schools, regularly provide for the religious instruction of their children at home.

(d) When parents have in their vicinity Catholic schools equal in every respect and often superior to the State schools, and yet favor the latter against the advice of pastor and bishop, they are in a state of sinful contumacy, and ought to be refused absolution until they repent.

(e) The unproved contumacious conduct of a few will after awhile break down our entire system of church schools.

(f) In Belgium and other countries of Europe parents who send their children to State schools are refused absolution until they withdraw them.

2. With regard to Section No. 6, I would add after "*quas Status moderatur*," provided the faith and morals of Catholic children are safeguarded as in the Catholic denominational schools of England, etc. The quotation from the Baltimore Council ought to be complete, and include these words: "*nisi forte Ordinarius in casu particulari aliud permitti posse judicet*."

3. In relation to No. 7, I remark that all attempts on the part of bishops in the past to improve the State schools have been followed by eliminating from them all traces of Christianity as found in the various Protestant sects and substituting therefor what was worse, infidelity.

4. The second paragraph of the eighth section supposes that what it demands for the safe Catholic education of our children is attainable under our present State School System. This is a fallacy. The American people are not in a frame of mind to concede what is essential to the end in view. In certain localities more favorable arrangements may be made than in others. There is one such place in my diocese [Lima]. The teachers are religious appointed by the bishop; they undergo the required examination of the State as to competency in secular branches of learning; the pupils are all the Catholic children of the parish, living near enough to the school, without regard to State school districts or limits; there are never more than two or three non-Catholic children in this school. By the open confession of the State School Commissioner for the county these Sisters are the most competent, and the children of this school are the most polite and best behaved of any State school in the country. And yet we are not altogether satisfied. There is something lacking in the religious tone of the school, and the children do not get all they have a right to.

5. With regard to the first part of Section IX, I beg to say that this diocese has provided Catholic schools in every parish where it is possible to have them; that these schools are in buildings, equipments, and the capacity of their teachers equal to and, it is generally admitted, superior to the State schools in the same localities. Where we have no parochial schools at the present time, we propose to have them just as soon as possible, if this present disturbance does not throw us back for some years.

We have always had Catechism classes for all our children in all the parishes of the diocese.

6. With regard to Section X, I would ask, if the second sentence permits parents to place their children, daughters especially, in non-Catholic boarding schools, when there are superior Convents under the direction of Religious safer and better in every sense of the word at their service. This sentence in Section X has a dangerous sound.

7. Anyone acquainted with our country and its people knows that the time has not come for an arrangement with the State in relation to our rights in this matter of school education. If the proposed arrangement is one by which we are to hand over our schools to the State to be de-Catholicized and made hot-beds of indifferentism with regard to all religion, we can move in this matter, for on this basis non-Catholics will readily meet us. The less we

have to do with the State the better, until the State is ready to come to us with propositions that will protect the Catholicity of our schools and leave us our rights as Catholics and citizens. In the meantime it is better for us to bear with injustice and wrong, and preserve our virility and independence. This is what I have to say respecting Section XI.

8. Any remarks that I might make on Section XII have already been expressed in the above statements.

9. Section XIII. It does not seem fair to require our teachers to undergo examinations before the State authorities until the State is prepared to acknowledge our just rights. The examinations required by the Ordinary ought to suffice. I think it is putting an indignity on our Religious to ask this of them. In this diocese, our school children voluntarily stand the same examinations to which the State school children are subjected, and when our children show better results, as they uniformly do, it ought to be satisfactory to all that their teachers are competent. Our Catholic people are perfectly satisfied with their schools, and intelligent Protestants admit their superiority.

I sum up by saying:

1. In a country like ours, whose form of government depends on the people, the less interference with our natural rights we concede to what is called the State the better. Later on, when our country becomes less Christian and more infidel, greater concessions will be demanded. All concessions in time acquire the force of rights.

2. Confessional, or denominational schools, such as they have in Canada and England, might answer in places where we cannot do better.

3. In my judgment, it may be generations before the American people will be disposed to listen to the adoption of confessional schools.

4. In the meantime our only alternative is to establish parochial schools wherever we can, and to raise the standard of secular education above that of the State schools, while not neglecting the religious care of those children who are obliged to go to the public schools because there are no parochial schools in their neighborhood.

5. Msgr. Satolli's propositions concede too much.¹⁵¹

Despite Bishop McQuaid's activities in behalf of the Parochial School System and his trenchant criticism of the Public School System, he was picked by friends as a candidate for nomination as Regent of the University of the State of New York. He declared January 19, 1894: "At first I was disposed to have nothing to do with regard to this affair, but since it appears that Malone and Lambert are candidates, it becomes a duty to allow my name to be used, even if I should meet with defeat. All I care about is to defeat these two." In regard to the former, he found ample reason to dispute his candidacy in "what Malone is reported in the *Brooklyn Eagle* as saying. A man's worst enemy is always one of his household." These things were so grave that he asked Archbishop Corrigan: "Ought not Bishop McDonnell to bring to the notice of the Delegate what Malone says about parochial schools, etc.?"¹⁵² Two months later, on the return of a friend from Albany, Bishop McQuaid informed his

¹⁵¹ Original draft in my possession.

¹⁵² Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan, January 19, 1894. 1894, Bishops, etc., New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

Archbishop that "the prospect there is that Malone will get the election for Regent. His friends, and they include all the clerical cranks of the State, have been working heaven and earth against me. Lambert is working for him." Bishop McQuaid's friend, Mayor Curran of Rochester, a Republican, found "that while the leaders are not opposed to me, the county members have been won over by misrepresentations, etc."¹⁵³ There were also other influences brought to bear upon the election against Bishop McQuaid in favor of Malone. He judged it all important to find out all about the outside clerical meddlers in the affairs of this State. "Archbishop Ireland is one, but there are others. I shall not be surprised to learn that among them are some of the University professors. It is just what N. N. would do."¹⁵⁴ However, the most active of all these was the first named who "began to write letters and send telegrams to prominent Republican politicians in favor of Malone." Bishop McQuaid made use of all his powers of expression to make Cardinal Ledochowski later understand the nature of Archbishop Ireland's intervention.

These letters and telegrams were handed around to politicians in New York City and in the halls of the Legislature at Albany, and were used to destroy all legitimate influence the Archbishop and Suffragans might have in their own State. We are represented as Democrats in politics while Mgr. Ireland was a Republican. No one had a right to designate me as belonging to any party, for ever since my consecration as bishop I have abstained absolutely from all dabbling in politics, and belonged to no party. So far as I know, my brother bishops have been equally cautious. The Rev. Mr. Malone was in no sense a proper representative of the Catholic body; he was not acceptable to the bishops of the State; he would not be able to do us any good while he might do us much harm as Regent; his ideas with regard to parochial schools were not in harmony with Catholic teaching; he publicly in the newspapers showed great contempt for his Ordinary, the bishop of Brooklyn.¹⁵⁵

The political campaign of 1894 ended in a Republican victory. Bishop McQuaid frankly confessed to Archbishop Corrigan, November 7, 1894: "The Democrats have gone under overwhelmingly. The fate of the amendments, though not certain, in all likelihood follows the party. The course of Ireland and Malone helped some, but the party was past saving. The Republicans themselves had no idea how great their victory was to be."¹⁵⁶ However, before the elections circumstances were such that the Republican Party was glad to have the services of a man like

¹⁵³ Same to same, March 23, 1894. *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ Same to same, March 31, 1894. *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ c. February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

¹⁵⁶ 1894, *Bishops, etc.* New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

Archbishop Ireland. The Democratic Party in their Convention had openly and forcibly disavowed the leading principles of the A. P. A., which the Republican Convention refused to do. Besides the Constitutional Convention with a large Republican majority adopted an amendment forbidding all support of denominational, also therefore of parochial schools, out of public money. Nevertheless, the Archbishop of St. Paul personally intervened in favor of the Republican Party in the State of New York.

Archbishop Ireland came to Philadelphia in the beginning of October, 1894, to be present at a meeting of the Archbishops and, going to New York, remained there and in the neighborhood until the end of November, returning to St. Paul just in time for the First Sunday of Advent. While he was in New York, the electioneering campaign was at fever heat. Both parties were holding public meetings. The Republicans held two such meetings, at which Ireland was present, occupying a conspicuous seat on the rostrum among the speakers and leaders of the party. These facts were duly recorded in the newspapers of the following day. . . . Then a few days before the election, he prepared a paper in favor of the Republican Party, in which he sophistically argued that we should not bring religion into politics, etc. This paper, together with a letter by the Rev. Mr. Malone, and a most bitter anti-Catholic speech directed chiefly against our Catholic Schools among the Indians by the Hon. Mr. Linton was printed and circulated by hundred of thousands of copies throughout the State by agents of the Republican Party, a few days before the election, too late for a refutation of the sophistries of the Catholic Archbishop.¹⁵⁷

Bishop McQuaid waxed still more indignant when he heard from New York that "after the election a very large sum of money was apparently loaned, but really given by the grateful Republicans to Archbishop Ireland to help him out of his financial difficulties, occasioned by his speculation in lands and railroad stocks."¹⁵⁸ Bishop McQuaid determined to call a halt to such proceedings, and on November 25, 1894, read a public protest in his Cathedral that was spread throughout the country by the public press. The next day he informed Archbishop Corrigan: "It is to the point, and its meaning will be clear to all. I did not mince matters."¹⁵⁹ Cardinal Rampolla wrote Bishop McQuaid later what great pain this public attack on an archbishop had caused the Holy Father, and Cardinal Ledochowski referred the examination of the affair to the Archbishop of New York. Bishop McQuaid replied to Cardinal Rampolla that he would

¹⁵⁷ Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Ledochowski, c. February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Bishops, etc.*, 1894. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

detail the motives of his attack in a letter to the Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski, who could then explain the whole matter to the Holy Father, as Roman Authorities would thus come to understand under what circumstances Bishop McQuaid acted as he did.¹⁶⁰ Bishop McQuaid wrote in part:

I felt it to be a duty of conscience to speak out publicly against the irregular doings of Mgr. Ireland. I was willing to expose myself to abuse, and even censure, in the hope of checking a growing danger to the Church. I am willing to suffer so that the Church can be guarded. Mgr. Ireland's offence was public, the Catholic laity were shocked and scandalized, the members of the Democratic Party, Catholic and non-catholic, were angry beyond measure at this introduction of a new element, the paid services of a Catholic Archbishop, into political wranglings and warfare. The general silence seemed to them like acquiescence. They now know that Mgr. Ireland's political methods are not approved by all, unless the Holy See should decide that they are commendable.¹⁶¹

Two years later, when Bishop McQuaid received the Brief from Rome transferring four counties from the Diocese of Buffalo to the Diocese of Rochester, he could not help remarking: "Evidently over there in Rome they can't bear me much ill-will for the lecture I gave Ireland, or they would not enlarge the diocese of Rochester in my lifetime."¹⁶² Subsequently, events wrought a change in Archbishop Ireland, if we can believe Bishop McQuaid's words addressed to his Metropolitan, September 19, 1896: "Archbishop Ireland's conversion is just in time. I hope it will be permanent."¹⁶³ The Faribault and Stillwater arrangements, which Rome decided could be tolerated, but did not approve despite persistent mistranslation of Latin words, came to an untimely end as all such earlier arrangements in the State of New York. Later in life, Archbishop Ireland's championship of the Catholic School System could not be more pronounced than it was. Fortunately, an interchange of visits by the two prelates to their respective episcopal cities made these two prominent members of the American Hierarchy drop the old spirit of animosity towards each other, and work together more closely for God and his Church.

While the New York State Constitutional Convention of 1894

¹⁶⁰ Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Rampolla. Original draft of translation in my possession. Archbishop Corrigan to Bishop McQuaid, January 16, 1895. Material for Corrigan Life. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

¹⁶¹ c. February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

¹⁶² Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan. January 20, 1897. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

¹⁶³ 1896, *Bishops and Dignitaries*. *Ibid*.

cut off all possibility of support for the parochial schools out of public money, it refused to follow the same policy towards Catholic and other denominational charitable institutions. It did this despite the amendment framed under the influence of the "National League for the Protection of American Institutions," which declared: "No law shall be passed respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the State, or any county, city, town, village, or other civil division use its property or credit or any money raised by taxation or otherwise, or aiding by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or in any other manner, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control." By its rejection diocesan charitable institutions—the Boys' and the Girls' Orphan asylums that Bishop McQuaid found established on his arrival in Rochester and later rebuilt on an enlarged scale, St. Ann's Home for the Aged, St. Mary's Hospital, continued to receive opportune State aid to supplement their main support derived from Catholics. Even the school teachers in the Asylums are salaried by the State despite the persevering efforts of a prominent Rochester A. P. A., that only ceased with death, to prevent the State authorities from doing so. The State also continued to support Catholic chaplains in its penal and eleemosynary institutions, and the example of the State was and is rivalled in this matter at Rochester by both county and municipality. This condition of affairs was not always thus.

The most serious problem along these lines was offered by the Western House of Refuge established at Rochester for the reformation of juvenile delinquents. Previous to Bishop McQuaid's arrival in Rochester, efforts to obtain the right of worship and Catholic instruction for the Catholic boys confined there had failed. When Bishop McQuaid brought the matter before the managers of the institution, he received considerable support from some, but encountered too much opposition from others to be successful.¹⁶⁴ The Protestant chaplain continued his ministration to

¹⁶⁴ November Quarterly meeting, 1869; committee meeting, December 4 and 30, 1869; managers' meeting, January 4, 1870; *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, November 17, 1869 and January 5, 1870.

all, both Catholics and Protestants, claiming to give only general moral instruction, which the Catholic managers nevertheless knew to be sectarian. These men tried in vain to make their opponents realize what a powerful factor for good Catholic worship and instruction were in the reformation of Catholic wayward boys. Peculiar circumstances brought about a better appreciation of this at the Alms House according to the report the Protestant chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Van Ingen, made to the Supervisors:

It is well known that a very large proportion of the inmates of your Alms House are foreign born, and that most of these are in religious faith Roman Catholics. It is a part of their education to make much of attendance once each Sunday at the public worship of their church; and it had been customary to indulge many of them in going to the city on Sunday morning for this purpose. The results from their yielding to the solicitations of appetite or the false kindness of acquaintances were subversive of the order and discipline of the House; and an effectual remedy was found in the rule laid down by the present officers and rigidly enforced, forbidding absence on Sundays, in conjunction with an offer of the chapel on Sundays for religious services by a minister of their own faith. Such services were held in consequence in the chapel at an early hour on Sunday morning by Father Baraffi, a R. C. clergyman of courteous manners and earnest devotion to his work, under appointment from his bishop, beginning in March last and suspended when the chapel became a dormitory in the autumn.

The influence of this arrangement upon the good order of the House has often been attested by the Officers in charge.¹⁶⁵

New tactics were now adopted by Bishop McQuaid in regard to the Western House of Refuge. He tried to have pastors obtain the signatures of the boys' parents and guardians to a petition in behalf of the Rights of Conscience of their boys. Finally, the following petition was presented to the Managers at their regular quarterly meeting, August, 1874:

The undersigned parents and guardians of boys now in the Western House of Refuge, and professing the Catholic religion, respectfully petition the Managers of said institution to permit the holding of religious exercises in harmony with the religious belief of these boys. Knowing that the teachings and influence of religion will do more to make permanent the reformation sought in the House of Refuge than any other means, we urge our request that these boys shall not be deprived of so great a help to present and future good conduct, and shall not be debarred from the free exercise of religion guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States and the State of New York.¹⁶⁶

The Constitution of the United States, Article I of the Amendments, declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Constitution of the State of New York, Article I, Section 3, made a more pertinent declaration: "The free exer-

¹⁶⁵ *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, January 8, 1873.

¹⁶⁶ *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, August 19 and November 30, 1874.

cise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind." On the motion of Manager Purcell the petition was referred to a committee of three to consider and report at the next meeting. Managers Purcell, Andrews, and Chapin were appointed to the committee, which submitted a Majority Report signed by E. R. Andrews and Louis Chapin and a Minority Report signed by Wm. Purcell in the November meeting. The Majority Report maintained (1) "that to invite the religious teachers of all sects to hold separate religious exercises in the House of Refuge would be subversive of all discipline and fraught only with evil;" (2) that "if there are any rights resting with individuals in regard to religion, they rest with the children, not with the parents and guardians." Its signers therefore recommended "that the request be not complied with, but that an invitation be extended to the clergy of all denominations to visit the institution and to address the boys on topics of practical life, morality, and religion at such times as may be consistent with the duties of the boys under the direction of the Superintendent or the Board of Managers." The Minority Report thoroughly treated the issue both from the legal and the moral point of view. The opinion of Judge Selden was sought by Mr. Purcell and upheld the rights of Catholic boys to Catholic worship in the institution in which they were confined. Precedents for this were gathered by him from "the practice and experience of other reformatories and other prisons both in this and other countries." All this led to the formulation of the resolution: "That the prayer of the petition of parents and guardians of Catholic children confined in the Western House of Refuge for freedom of religious profession and worship be and is hereby granted in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Acting Committee may prescribe." The resolution was modified so as to grant the requested Catholic worship "under the rules and regulations of the institution" and "in the chapel and under the direction of our superintendent" with the Catholic clergy to "be appointed by this Board." The modified resolution was adopted by a vote of eleven against two. Even one of the signers of the Majority Report, Mr. Chapin, cast his vote in its favor.¹⁶⁷ The March meeting, 1875, accordingly elected two

¹⁶⁷ *Union and Advertiser*, November 30, 1874.

chaplains, one Catholic and the other Protestant.¹⁶⁸ While Mr. William Purcell was perfectly competent to put together the Minority Report, its methods are largely those followed by Bishop McQuaid in his great lectures on Free Christian Schools. Many years after this, when the Western House of Refuge moved out of the city into the country, two distinct chapels were erected on its grounds, one for Protestants, and the other for Catholics with a resident chaplain attached. The justice of such an arrangement meanwhile had become more and more recognized. Ten years after the election of the first Catholic chaplain to the Western House of Refuge, Bishop McQuaid was able to write Bishop Gilmour, January 11, 1885: "Our new Governor, successor to Cleveland, came out in his message for Freedom of Religious Worship, clearly, broadly, and boldly. Both parties are bidding for the honor of presenting the Bill. While the game is in hand and sure, what are the shortsighted New Yorkers doing, but spoiling the bill by putting in it that no minister shall be paid. If these stupid men would also arrange a plan by which ministers could live without cost, they would show some sense. However, we shall be able to strike out this clause."¹⁶⁹ Despite new fears the measure finally passed in a satisfactory form, and was duly signed by the Governor, David B. Hill. Thus freedom of religious worship became guaranteed by law to all inmates of penal and public eleemosynary institutions within the State of New York.

Nevertheless, Bishop McQuaid was not completely satisfied in the last decade of his life with all that had been done, as there were still two great public institutions within his diocese without resident chaplains that ought to have had them. One of these was the Craig Colony for Epileptics at Sonyea, Livingston County, N. Y., where the State of New York had acquired possession of nearly 2,000 acres of land, and built a home for the judicious and scientific treatment of the indigent epileptics of the State. At first there were only visiting clergymen officiating at the Colony, but January 9, 1900, the Board of Managers resolved: "That it is the sense of this meeting that there should be two permanent

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, March 17, 1875.

¹⁶⁹ Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

Chaplains for the Colony, one Protestant and one Catholic.”¹⁷⁰ This opened the way for Bishop McQuaid, who informed Archbishop Corrigan of his plans in regard to the institution, April 17, 1900.

The present Chapel is a large room to be used by both [Catholics and non-Catholics], and also for general purposes of assembly. I proposed to build a Chapel and residence for the use of Catholics alone. . . . In this Chapel there can be many religious services and devotions, the Stations of the Cross and reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.

I intend that Rochester Diocese shall bear one-half of the cost, and I think that the other dioceses of the State might meet the other half. With your consent I will place among some of the pastors of New York collection cards with 20 squares, each square representing 25 cents, the whole card \$5. Many pastors will take no interest in the good work; others will gladly help. The whole cost will be about \$8,000.

All I ask of my brother bishops is their permission to make this appeal to their people through their pastors.

A point of view deserving of consideration is the introduction of this arrangement into a State Institution. It may in time lead to similar arrangements in other places.¹⁷¹

The last point was in fact duly appreciated by the Board of Managers at the Colony. In their meeting, July 10, 1900, they seized the occasion to frame the following resolution of acceptance and thanks.

Whereas, By virtue of the large and daily increasing number of patients at Craig Colony and its present meagre facilities in the way of a house in which religious service may be observed, and

Whereas, A large percentage of all the patients at the colony are of one religious faith—the Catholic—and

Whereas, The Right Reverend B. J. McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester, N. Y., has offered to donate funds to construct a Catholic chapel, in conjunction with a cottage for a priest, on the colony, free of all expense to the State, giving the managers of the colony the right to approve the plans and location of the buildings,

Resolved, That we, the Board of Managers of Craig Colony, do hereby accept the magnanimous offer of the Bishop of Rochester, and extend to him our thanks.

We feel that the Bishop of Rochester, in building a chapel of this kind, is engaging in pioneer work that will have widespread influence.¹⁷²

The work made due progress, and on February 18, 1902, Bishop McQuaid “visited the Craig Colony for Epileptics to inspect the chapel and the chaplain’s residence. I was much pleased with both, but the dedication of the chapel is postponed until April 8, by which time the stained-glass windows and Stations will be in place.”¹⁷³ With this important work practically

¹⁷⁰ Minutes of Board of Managers. Kindness of Dr. Wm. T. Shanahan, Medical Superintendent, through Rev. Walter McCarthy.

¹⁷¹ M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Vol. 15, Archbishop’s House.

¹⁷² Minutes of the Board of Managers.

¹⁷³ Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan. New York Diocesan Archives, Vol. 35. Archbishop House.

finished, he turned his attention to the other State Institution, for which he proposed to do almost as much, as he informed Archbishop Corrigan, February 19, 1902:

I am now preparing to build a chaplain's house and small chapel attached for week day's Mass, reservation of the B. S., at the State Soldiers' Home at Bath, Steuben Co. This will only cost about \$3,500 and no appeal will be made outside of the Diocese of Rochester. The Chaplain can use the chapel on the grounds for Sundays. The Chapel connected with his house will not hold more than fifty. There are about 600 or 700 soldiers in the Home. The trustees are not unwilling to build the house, but I preferred to build it myself, as thus I would have a good hold in the place.¹⁷⁴

Bishop McQuaid's plans were also duly carried out at the Soldiers' Home. Thus Catholic ministrations were brought into two State Institutions in a way to benefit the inmates, who needed even more than others the ever present consolation of their Holy Religion.

FREDERICK J. ZWIERLEIN, D. Sc., M. H.,
St. Bernard's Seminary,
Rochester, N. Y.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*